a cover disposed on the foam core; and

a heat shield adjacent the cover, wherein the dock pad is adapted to seal against the vehicle by virtue of the foam core being compressible, the cover being pliable, and the heat shield being pliable, wherein the heat shield has a higher thermal conductivity than the foam core.

7. A dock pad adapted to seal against a vehicle parked against the dock pad, comprising:

a foam core;

a cover disposed on the foam core; and

a heat shield adjacent the cover, wherein the dock pad is adapted to seal against the vehicle by virtue of the foam core being compressible, the cover being pliable, and the heat shield being pliable, wherein the heat shield has a higher reflectivity than the foam core.

8. The dock pad of claim 7, wherein the heat shield has a higher reflectivity than the cover.

9. The dock pad of claim 10, wherein the cover has a higher auto ignition point than the foam core.

10. A dock pad adapted to seal against a vehicle parked against the dock pad, comprising:

a foam core;

a cover disposed on the foam core; and

a heat shield adjacent the cover, wherein the dock pad is adapted to seal against the vehicle by virtue of the foam core being compressible, the cover being pliable,

and the heat shield being pliable, wherein the cover has a lower auto ignition point than the heat shield.

11. The dock pad of claim 10, wherein the foam core has a lower auto ignition point than the heat shield.

17. A dock pad, comprising:

a foam core;

a cover disposed on the foam core; and

a heat shield interposed between the cover and the foam core, wherein the heat shield has a higher thermal conductivity than the foam core and the cover.

20. A dock pad, comprising: a backer; a foam core; a cover; and a heat shield; wherein the foam core is between the backer and a sealing surface of the cover, the heat shield is between the foam core and the sealing surface, the backer is more rigid than the foam core and the cover, and the heat shield has a higher thermal conductivity than the foam core.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under various anticipation and obviousness rejections based upon the Styba reference. The applicants have considered the rejections in Paper No. 7 and still maintain that they are improper and that the claims are in condition for allowance. Therefore, today, the applicants are filing a notice of appeal in this case.

The amendment to the specification removes a line of text submitted with the original application in error. The amendments to the claims place the claims in better form for appeal and, therefore, are to be entered pursuant to MPEP §714.12. Specifically, the amendments focus on physical properties of the heat shield. The specific physical properties (and the desirability of using such materials) is nowhere taught or suggested by Styba. (1)